

Village of Barrington
Architectural Review Commission
Minutes Summary

Date: October 23, 2003

Time: 7:30 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room
200 South Hough Street
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: John Julian III, Chairperson, Architectural Review Commission
Joe Coath, Vice Chairperson, Architectural Review Commission
Stephen Petersen, Architectural Review Commission
Shea Lubecke, Architectural Review Commission
Karen Plummer, Architectural Review Commission

Staff Members: Jim Wallace, Director of Building and Planning
Jeff O'Brien, Planner/Zoning Coordinator

Call to Order

Chair Julian called the meeting to order at 7:34 p.m.

Roll Call

The Roll Call noted the following: John Julian III, present; Joseph Coath, present; Lisa McCauley, absent; Shea Lubecke, present; Stephen Petersen, present; Karen Plummer, absent; John Patsey, absent. There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded. Karen Plummer arrived at 7:36 pm.

Old Business

ARC 03-08 Mark General Contracting, 628 South Grove Avenue (Historic - Public Hearing continued)

Petitioner: Mark Bussanmas

Mr. Petersen recused himself and left the dias.

Mr. Bussanmas clarified that Mark T. and Dawn S. Bussanmas are the owner names on the deed for the property, not Mark General Contracting. He also noted that twenty-nine neighbors on Grove Avenue have signed a petition supporting his proposal. He then gave a brief review of the proposed work.

Mr. Julian asked if there was any public comment on the petition. There was none.

Mr. O'Brien gave a summary of the staff report, which states that the petition meets the eleven standards for a Contributing Structure (side entrance) and the three standards for a Non-contributing Structure (detached garage), and recommends approval. Mr. O'Brien also noted receipt of a landscape plan from the petitioner and a letter from Ms. Connie Castle Schuly stating that the garage is more than fifty years old.

Mr. Coath asked if there was a record of findings on the existing garage proposed for demolition.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the ARC had found that the existing garage is Non-contributing.

Mr. Coath asked if in light of the new evidence being presented by the petitioner, if the finding is open for reconsideration.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the introduction of new evidence by the petitioner opens the findings for reconsideration.

Mr. Busanmas stated that he believes the original garage was demolished in 1956, so the current garage must have been built in 1956 or 1957. Referring to the landscape drawing from 1941, he showed that an arbor was located where the current garage stands, and that the original garage existed on the lot prior to its subdivision. It is now on the other lot.

Mr. Coath stated that the ARC may have made its original findings based on insufficient information.

Mr. Bussanmas stated that the ARC had earlier stated that the garage could be demolished, even if it was more than fifty years old.

Ms. Lubecke moved to approve the petition and to adopt the findings of fact from staff. Ms. Plummer seconded. Ayes: Mr. Julian, Ms. Lubecke, Ms. Plummer. Nay: Mr. Coath. Motion carried 3-1.

ARC 03-20 Kohanzo Residence, 540 South Cook Street (Historic – Preliminary Public Hearing continued)

Petitioner: Dan Kohanzo, owner and Sarah Petersen, architect.

Mr. Petersen remained recused and not at the dias.

Mr. Kohanzo summarized the status of the petition thus far, and noted that a front porch was also being considered.

Ms. Petersen stated that the existing garage needs to be demolished. The ARC had determined it to be a Non-contributing Structure. A variation had been obtained for the construction of a new garage as depicted in the plans. A new front porch is to be built, in front of the existing former front porch that had been converted to living space.

Mr. Julian asked if there was any public comment.

Mr. Warren Hayes, 545 South cook Street, who lives diagonally across the street from the property, asked the following questions:

1. Does the new porch leave adequate space to the public walk in front of the property?
2. The new garage design shown at a previous meeting had a steeple. Has the design been changed?

Mr. O'Brien summarized the staff report, noting that the proposed garage and porch meet the three standards for Non-contributing Structures. He noted that three variations are requested, which will be considered before the Board of Trustees on November 10th. The petition is going to the ARC before the Board considers the variation requests. The previous consensus of the ARC was that the existing garage is Non-contributing. The staff report recommends issuance of a COA.

Mr. Coath noted that the plans for the garage indicate "siding to match existing". Will the petitioner be matching the wood that is beneath the vinyl siding?

Ms. Petersen stated there is existing stucco siding and that the new siding will be wood. The new siding will have a three- or four-inch lap.

Mr. Coath asked what kind of overhead door will be installed.

Ms. Petersen showed two sample types to the ARC.

Mr. Coath asked what type of service door will be installed.

Ms. Petersen said the service door will be simple- mullions above and a panel below.

Mr. Coath asked if the door will be wood, and Ms. Petersen stated they would prefer to install a steel door, which will last much longer.

Ms. Lubecke stated she has difficulty with the tandem garage layout. There appears to be sufficient space on the lot for a standard two-car garage configuration. The tandem configuration will cause long-range problems.

Ms. Petersen stated that the standard configuration uses up existing yard (green space) and a tandem configuration uses up existing driveway (impervious surface).

Ms. Plummer asked if it is the ARC's responsibility to review design based on what is best for the homeowner, or based on what is best for the neighborhood.

Ms. Lubecke stated that her concerns are related to the proposed garage's appropriateness to the site.

Mr. Julian stated he is concerned with the appropriateness of the proposed structure to the site, rather than the use of the structure.

Ms. Plummer stated that the petitioner has responded to the suggestions made by the ARC in its previous review. From the street, the tandem configuration looks better.

Mr. Coath stated that the tandem configuration is not ideal, but it maintains the historical character. He does not believe a side-by-side configuration will work on the lot.

Ms. Petersen, in response to the question from Mr. Hayes, stated that the new porch meets all required setbacks in the zoning district.

Mr. Coath asked if the new porch will match existing cornice details.

Ms. Petersen said what detail remains will be matched.

Mr. Coath said they should consider adding back some of the details that were originally there.

Ms. Petersen responded that stucco houses typically had simple details; they intend to keep it simple.

Mr. Coath said he was specifically referring to crown moldings at the eaves, which may have been removed at one time. The petitioner should also consider adding them to the new garage. The addition of crowns would help bring the house up to the stature of its neighbors.

MOTION: Ms. Plummer moved to approve, with a recommendation that the petitioner install the overhead door containing lights and add crown molding, and to adopt the staff findings of fact. Seconded by Mr. Coath. Aye: Mr. Julian, Mr. Coath, Ms. Plummer. Nay: Ms. Lubecke. Motion carried 3-1.

New Business

ARC 03-21 Makray Memorial Golf Course Maintenance Building 1110 East Northwest Highway (Non-Historic- Preliminary Public Meeting)

Petitioners: Robert Best, owner's representative and David Gillespie, architect.

Mr. Petersen returned to the dias.

Mr. Best explained that the new maintenance building will be in the same location as the existing building, but will be much larger and better. The building will be partially sunk into the hillside and will have heavy

landscaping to shield it from the view of the neighbors.

Mr. Gillespie said the shingles will be charcoal black architectural asphalt and the walls will be split-face block. He showed samples. There will be forty-two new trees: 8'-12' Colorado Spruce, which will screen the building on three sides, and hide it from the residences on either side.

Ms. Lubecke asked what the size of the existing maintenance building is.

Mr. Gillespie said the existing building is less than 1,000 square feet. The new building will be 4,500 square feet.

Ms. Plummer said it will be beneficial to have the new larger building, so that equipment can be stored inside, out of view. She also likes the berms and the evergreen trees for screening.

Mr. Julian asked about the HVAC system.

Mr. Gillespie stated that there will only be interior gas-fired heater units- no exterior condensers or equipment.

Ms. Lubecke asked about the height of the existing building, and Mr. Gillespie said it is about 10 feet high.

Mr. Julian asked if there would be a way to give the building more of a residential appearance, and Mr. Gillespie said it would be difficult, as this is a utility building.

Mr. Petersen asked if they could try to match some of the design features of the clubhouse, and Mr. Gillespie said that the clubhouse is 1,900 feet away, and is very fancy. The intent for the maintenance building is to be earth-toned and more hidden.

Mr. Petersen suggested that some offsets in the long wall of the rectangular building would reduce the apparent size of the structure, and would enable it to blend better with the residential neighbors. False windows and some gables could be added to help achieve this.

Mr. Best said they would investigate those ideas.

Mr. Petersen specifically noted that the north side needed attention. Some fenestration, such as windows, or maybe even blank window recesses, would be of benefit. He then asked about dumpsters, and Mr. Gillespie said there will be no dumpsters on site. Mr. Petersen further noted that possibly one or two bays on the north side could be offset (moved back from the principal plane of the elevation) to create interest.

Mr. Coath stated that the neighbors are in close proximity, so they need to be respected. He asked if the neighbors are aware of this project.

Mr. Gillespie said they have not been specifically contacted regarding this building, but they definitely should be aware, due to the massive golf course renovation project underway.

Mr. Coath suggested the neighbors should be forewarned.

Mr. Best noted that the building meets all required setbacks.

Ms. Lubecke suggested that maybe the building could be rotated somewhat, in keeping with the residences on the adjacent lots, which are not oriented squarely to the street.

Mr. Coath suggested the use of 35- or 40-year shingles rather than 25-year shingles. They will last longer and the shadows will read better.

Mr. O'Brien said that staff will send the petitioner a letter next week, summarizing the ARC's direction.

Mr. Best asked if they should try to have their final meeting on the building next time. The consensus of the ARC was that it could work, if they return with a design responsive to the ARC's comments.

Mr. Petersen motion to approve with findings of fact. Patsey seconded. All yes, Julian-abstain.

ARC 03-22 Rappleye, 312 South Grove Avenue, (Historic) Public Hearing.

Sally and Mark Rappleye, owners.

Mr. and Ms. Rappleye were sworn in.

Ms. Rappleye stated that five years ago, they added to and remodeled their original residence. At the time, they did not have funds to replace the windows, so they decided to do it later. In the interim, the historic preservation regulations went into effect. There are thirteen windows in the old portion of the house, which they wish to replace with "in-kind" Marvin windows. The existing windows have minimal historic value- the previous owners removed portions of the sashes in order to install aluminum jamb inserts. Now the sashes are smaller than the original design. Weights and pulleys are gone, and no original hardware remains. No individual window has all of its original glass. Many of the windows have replaced lites; there is probably about 60% - 70% original glazing remaining. Also, the 1983 historic survey said the original house was brick and stucco. The house now has vinyl siding. They would like to review and rebut the staff report.

Mr. Julian asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

Mr. O'Brien gave a summary of the staff report, which recommends that the windows be repaired rather than replaced.

Mr. Julian asked if the addition has new windows, and Ms. Rappleye answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Julian asked if all the original double-hung windows have been modified with aluminum jamb inserts, and if all have had some of the glass replaced.

Ms. Rappleye answered yes to both questions.

Mr. Coath said that he believes the existing windows are more than 50% gone. The decision to restore or replace should be left to the petitioner. The French casement windows, however, have not been compromised, and should be preserved. Mr. Coath also recommended using wood screen/storm units if the Marvin replacement windows are installed.

Mr. Petersen said he believes the original double-hung windows are more than 50% gone.

Ms. Lubecke said that replacement windows drastically reduce the quality of an historic home. Such changes always show- the dimensions are not the same, the materials are not the same and the proportions and construction are not the same. Restored windows can last longer than new windows.

Ms. Plummer asked if Mr. Coath and Mr. Petersen had looked at the windows and recommend replacement based on their inspection.

Mr. Petersen responded that they had.

Mr. Julian noted that if there was an attempt to restore the windows, the replacement wood would not be heart pine or similar authentic materials with the same performance characteristics as the original material.

Ms. Rappleye said that in February of 2003 Mr. Wallace and Mr. Sbiral had visited the site and stated that

it might be possible to administratively approve replacement of the windows. They suggested two members of the ARC inspect the windows first. Mr. Coath and Mr. Petersen then visited the site, and Mr. Petersen said he felt the windows should be replaced. Mr. Coath did not make a decision. We consulted a list of contractors formerly provided by the ARC. Two said the job was too small and another said they do not work in Barrington, but referred them to Fritz, an expert who formerly chaired the Iowa historic preservation group. Mr. Fritz said that the aluminum jamb liners are an inferior product, and create issues by reducing the dimensions of the sashes. He considers the sashes ruined and the original crafted joining compromised. Janick Custom Millwork said too much sash had been removed for restoration, but they could make historically accurate replacement windows for \$200 - \$2,500 per window.

Ms. Lubecke said entirely new historically accurate replacement windows are not necessary- what is needed is restoration of the existing windows, to save as much historic material as possible.

Mr. Petersen said that incompatibility of the old and new wood could cause warping problems.

Mr. O'Brien asked that the ARC adopt a finding of fact, and incorporate two elements to a motion: which windows need to be preserved, and what type of units are acceptable for the windows to be replaced.

Ms. Rappleye showed samples of replacement windows. There was a general discussion of the types of windows and whether or not to save the two casement windows.

The ARC proposed the following findings with respect to the standards relevant to the petition:

- Standard #2: Enough of the original material of the double-hung windows has been removed to make preservation of the windows impractical.
- Standard #3: The replacement windows will be recognized as new windows and will not create a false sense of history.
- Standard #5: Enough of the original material of the double-hung windows has been removed to make preservation of the windows impractical.
- Standard #6: Enough of the original material of the double-hung windows has been removed to make preservation of the windows impractical.

Mr. Petersen moved to approve the petition as submitted, with adoption of the findings as stated above.

Ms. Plummer seconded the motion. Aye: Mr. Julian, Mr. Coath, Mr. Petersen, Ms. Plummer. Nay: Ms. Lubecke. The motion carried 4-1.

Approval of Minutes

ARC deferred approval of any minutes. Mr. O'Brien stated that at the November 13th meeting, the ARC will have several sets of minutes that need to be approved, and will have a draft schedule for 2004 to review.

Adjournment

Mr. Petersen moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Plummer seconded the motion. All ayes. The meeting was adjourned at 9:42pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Wallace
Director of Building and Planning

John Julian III, Chairperson
Architectural Review Commission